

Approximation Algorithm for Cycle-Star Hub Network Design Problems and Cycle-Metric Labeling Problems

Yuko Kuroki[★] and Tomomi Matsui[★]

[★] Department of Industrial Engineering and Economics,
Graduate School of Engineering,
Tokyo Institute of Technology,

Abstract. We consider a single allocation hub-and-spoke network design problem which allocates each non-hub node to exactly one of given hub nodes so as to minimize the total transportation cost. This paper deals with a case in which the hubs are located in a cycle, which is called a cycle-star hub network design problem. The problem is essentially equivalent to a cycle-metric labeling problem. The problem is useful in the design of networks in telecommunications and airline transportation systems. We propose a $2(1 - 1/h)$ -approximation algorithm where h denotes the number of hub nodes. Our algorithm solves a linear relaxation problem and employs a dependent rounding procedure. We analyze our algorithm by approximating a given cycle-metric matrix by a convex combination of Monge matrices.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we propose a $2(1 - 1/h)$ -approximation algorithm for cycle-star hub network design problems with h hubs and/or a cycle-metric labeling problem with h labels.

Hub-and-spoke networks arise in airline transportation systems, delivery systems and telecommunication systems. Hub networks have an important role when there are many origins and destinations. Hub facilities work as switching points for flows. In order to reduce transportation costs and set-up costs in a large network, each non-hub node is allocated to exactly one of the hubs instead of assigning every origin-destination pair directly.

Hub location problems (HLPs) consist of locating hubs and of designing hub networks so as to minimize the total transportation cost. HLPs are formulated as quadratic integer programming problem by O’Kelly [25], first. Since O’Kelly proposed HLPs, many researches on HLPs have been done in various applications (see [3,9,12,16,20,26] for example).

In this paper, we discuss the situation in which the locations of the hubs are given, and deal with a problem, called a *single allocation hub-and-spoke network design problem*, which finds a connection of the non-hubs to the given hubs minimizing total transportation cost. Sohn and Park [27,28] proposed a

polynomial time exact algorithm for a problem with 2 hubs and proved NP-completeness of the problem even if the number of hubs is equal to 3. Iwasa et al. [18] proposed a simple 3-approximation algorithm and a randomized 2-approximation algorithm under the assumptions of triangle inequality. They also proposed a $(5/4)$ -approximation algorithm for the special case where the number of hubs is 3. Ando and Matsui [5] deal with the case in which all the nodes are embedded in a 2-dimensional plane and the transportation cost of an edge per unit flow is proportional to the Euclidean distance between the end nodes of the edge. They proposed a randomized $(1 + 2/\pi)$ -approximation algorithm. Saito et al. [29] discussed some facets of polytopes corresponding to the convex hull of feasible solutions of the problem.

Fundamental HLPs assume a full interconnection between hubs. Recently, several researches consider incomplete hub networks which arise especially in telecommunication systems (see [10,11,4,8] for example). These models are useful when set-up costs of hub links are considerably large or full interconnection is not required. There are researches which assume that hub networks constitute a particular structure such as a tree [19,14,15,23], a star [22,30,31], a path [24] or a cycle [17].

In this paper, we consider a single allocation hub-and-spoke network design problem where the given hubs are located in a cycle. We call this problem the *cycle-star hub network design problem*. When the number of hubs is 3, the hub network becomes a 3-cycle and constitutes a complete graph. Thus, the $4/3$ -approximation algorithm for a complete 3-hub network proposed in [18] is valid for this special case. In this paper we propose a $2(1 - 1/h)$ -approximation algorithm when a set of h hubs forms an h -cycle. To the best of our knowledge, our algorithm is the first approximation algorithm for this problem.

A single allocation hub-and-spoke network design problem is essentially equivalent to a metric labeling problem introduced by Kleinberg and Tardos in [21], which has connections to Markov random field and classification problems that arise in computer vision and related areas. They proposed an $O(\log h \log \log h)$ -approximation algorithm where h is the number of labels (hubs). Chuzhoy and Naor [13] showed that there is no polynomial time approximation algorithm with a constant ratio for the problem unless $P = NP$. We deal with a cycle-metric labeling problem where a given metric matrix is defined by an undirected cycle and non-negative edge length. Thus, our results give an important class of the metric labeling problem, which has a polynomial time approximation algorithm with a constant approximation ratio.

2 Problem Formulation

Let $H = \{1, 2, \dots, h\}$ be a set of hub nodes and N be a set of non-hub nodes where $|H| \geq 3$ and $|N| = n$. This paper deals with a single assignment hub network design problem which assigns each non-hub node to exactly one hub node. We discuss the case in which the set of hubs forms an undirected cycle, and the corresponding problem is called the *cycle-star hub network design problem*.

More precisely, we are given an undirected cycle $\Gamma = (H, T)$ defined by a vertex-set H and an edge-set $T = \{\{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\}, \dots, \{h-1, h\}, \{h, 1\}\}$. In the rest of this paper, we identify hub i and hub $h+i$ when there is no ambiguity. For each edge $e = \{i, i+1\} \in T$, the corresponding length, denoted by c_e or $c_{i, i+1}$ represents a non-negative cost per unit of flow on the edge. For each ordered pair $(p, i) \in N \times H$, c_{pi} also denotes a non-negative cost per unit flow on an undirected edge $\{p, i\}$. We denote a given non-negative amount of flow from a non-hub p to another non-hub q by $w_{pq} (\geq 0)$. Throughout this paper, we assume that $w_{pp} = 0$ ($\forall p \in N$). We discuss the problem for finding an assignment of non-hubs to hubs which minimizes the total transportation cost defined below.

When non-hub nodes p and q ($p \neq q$) are assigned hubs i and j , respectively, an amount of flow w_{pq} is sent along a path $((p, i), \Omega_{ij}, (j, q))$ where Ω_{ij} denotes a shortest path in $\Gamma = (H, T)$ between i and j . For each pair of hub nodes $(i, j) \in H^2$, c_{ij} denotes the length of a shortest path Ω_{ij} . More precisely, cycle Γ contains exactly two paths between i and j and c_{ij} denotes the minimum of the lengths of these two paths. It is easy to see that $c_{ij} = c_{ji}$. In the rest of this paper, a matrix $C = (c_{ij})$ defined above is called a *cost matrix* and/or a *cycle-metric matrix*. The transportation cost corresponding to a flow from p to q is defined by $w_{pq}(c_{pi} + c_{ij} + c_{qj})$.

Now we describe our problem formally. First, we introduce a 0-1 variable x_{pi} for each pair $\{p, i\} \in N \times H$ as follows:

$$x_{pi} = \begin{cases} 1 & (p \in N \text{ is assigned to } i \in H), \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}). \end{cases}$$

We have a constraint $\sum_{i \in H} x_{pi} = 1$ for each $p \in N$, since each non-hub is connected to exactly one hub. Then, the cycle-star hub network design problem can be formulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SAP:} \quad & \min. \quad \sum_{(p,q) \in N^2} w_{pq} \left(\sum_{i \in H} c_{pi} x_{pi} + \sum_{j \in H} c_{jq} x_{qj} + \sum_{(i,j) \in H^2} c_{ij} x_{pi} x_{qj} \right) \\ & \text{s. t.} \quad \sum_{i \in H} x_{pi} = 1 \quad (\forall p \in N), \\ & \quad \quad x_{pi} \in \{0, 1\} \quad (\forall (p, i) \in N \times H). \end{aligned}$$

The above formulation also appears in [28,18]. In case $h = 3$, 3-cycle Γ is a complete graph, and thus the corresponding problem is NP-complete [28].

Next we describe an integer linear programming problem proposed in [18], which is derived from SAP by employing the linearization technique introduced by Adams and Sherali [1]. We replace $x_{pi} x_{qj}$ with y_{piqj} . We have a new constraint $\sum_{i \in H} y_{piqj} = x_{qj}$ from the equation $\sum_{i \in H} x_{pi} = 1$ by multiplying both sides by x_{qj} . We also obtain a constraint $\sum_{j \in H} y_{piqj} = x_{pi}$ in a similar way. Then we

obtain the following 0-1 integer linear programming problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{SAPL:} \quad \min. \quad & \sum_{(p,q) \in N^2} w_{pq} \left(\sum_{i \in H} c_{pi} x_{pi} + \sum_{j \in H} c_{jq} x_{qj} + \sum_{(i,j) \in H^2} c_{ij} y_{piqj} \right) \\
\text{s. t.} \quad & \sum_{i \in H} x_{pi} = 1 \quad (\forall p \in N), \\
& \sum_{j \in H} y_{piqj} = x_{pi} \quad (\forall (p,q) \in N^2, \forall j \in H, p < q), \\
& \sum_{i \in H} y_{piqj} = x_{qj} \quad (\forall (p,q) \in N^2, \forall i \in H, p < q), \\
& x_{pi} \in \{0, 1\} \quad (\forall (p,i) \in N \times H), \\
& y_{piqj} \in \{0, 1\} \quad (\forall i \in H).
\end{aligned}$$

By substituting non-negativity constraints of all the variables for 0-1 constraints in SAPL, we obtain a linear relaxation problem, denoted by LRP. We can solve LRP in polynomial time by employing an interior point algorithm.

3 Monge Property and Dependent Rounding Procedure

First, we give the definition of a Monge matrix. A comprehensive research on the Monge property appears in a recent survey [7].

Definition 1. *An $m \times n$ matrix C' is a Monge matrix if and only if C' satisfies the so-called Monge property*

$$c'_{ij} + c'_{i'j'} \leq c'_{ij'} + c'_{i'j} \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i < i' \leq m, 1 \leq j < j' \leq n.$$

Although the Monge property depends on the orders of the rows and columns, in this paper, we say that a matrix is a Monge matrix when there exist permutations of rows and columns which yield the Monge property.

For each edge $e \in T$, we define a path $\Gamma^e = (H, T \setminus \{e\})$ obtained from cycle Γ by deleting the edge e . Let $C^e = (c_{ij}^e)$ be a cost matrix where c_{ij}^e denotes the length of the unique subpath of Γ^e connecting i and j .

Lemma 1. *For any edge $e = \{\ell, \ell + 1\} \in T$, a Monge matrix is obtained from C^e by permuting rows and columns simultaneously in the ordering $(\ell + 1, \ell + 2, \dots, h, 1, 2, \dots, \ell)$.*

Proof is omitted (see Appendix A or [7] for example).

Next, we approximate a given cost matrix (cycle-metric matrix) C by a convex combination of h Monge matrices $\{C^e \mid e \in T\}$. Alon et al. [2] considered approximating a cycle-metric matrix by a probability distribution over path-metric matrices, and showed a simple distribution such that the expected length of each edge is no more than twice its original length. The following theorem improves their result especially when the size of the cycle (number of hubs) is small.

Theorem 1. *Let C be a cost matrix obtained from a cycle $\Gamma = (H, T)$ and non-negative edge lengths $(c_e \mid e \in T)$. Then, there exists a vector of coefficients $(\theta_e \mid e \in T)$ satisfying*

$$\theta_e \geq 0 \ (\forall e \in T), \quad \sum_{e \in T} \theta_e = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad C \leq \sum_{e \in T} \theta_e C^e \leq 2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{h}\right) C.$$

Proof. When there exists an edge $e^\circ \in T$ satisfying $c_{e^\circ} \geq (1/2) \sum_{f \in T} c_f$, it is easy to see that for every pair $(i, j) \in H^2$, there exists a shortest path Ω_{ij} on cycle $\Gamma = (H, T)$ between i and j excluding edge e° . Thus, a given cost matrix C is equivalent to the Monge matrix C^{e° . In this case, the desired result is trivial.

We assume that $2c_e < L = \sum_{f \in T} c_f$ ($\forall e \in T$) and introduce a positive coefficient θ_e for each $e \in T$ defined by

$$\theta_e = \frac{c_e}{K} \prod_{f \in T \setminus \{e\}} (L - 2c_f)$$

where K is a normalizing constant which yields the equality $\sum_{e \in T} \theta_e = 1$. Let $\Omega_{ij} \subseteq T$ be a set of edges in a shortest path in Γ between i and j . The definition of the coefficients $(\theta_e \mid e \in T)$ directly implies that for each pair $(i, j) \in H^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{e \in T} \theta_e c_{ij}^e &= \sum_{e \notin \Omega_{ij}} \theta_e c_{ij} + \sum_{e \in \Omega_{ij}} \theta_e (L - c_{ij}) = \sum_{e \in T} \theta_e c_{ij} + \sum_{e \in \Omega_{ij}} \theta_e (L - 2c_{ij}) \\ &\leq c_{ij} \sum_{e \in T} \theta_e + \sum_{e \in \Omega_{ij}} \theta_e (L - 2c_e) \\ &= c_{ij} + \sum_{e \in \Omega_{ij}} \left((L - 2c_e) \frac{c_e}{K} \prod_{f \in T \setminus \{e\}} (L - 2c_f) \right) \\ &= c_{ij} + \frac{\prod_{f \in T} (L - 2c_f)}{K} \sum_{e \in \Omega_{ij}} c_e = c_{ij} + \frac{\prod_{f \in T} (L - 2c_f)}{K} c_{ij}. \end{aligned}$$

From the assumption, the last term appearing above is positive. Then, we have

$$\frac{K}{\prod_{f \in T} (L - 2c_f)} = \frac{\sum_{e \in T} \left(c_e \prod_{f \in T \setminus \{e\}} (L - 2c_f) \right)}{\prod_{f \in T} (L - 2c_f)} = \sum_{e \in T} \frac{c_e}{L - 2c_e}.$$

Now we introduce a function $f(z_1, \dots, z_h) = \sum_{\ell=1}^h z_\ell / (L - 2z_\ell)$ defined on a domain $\{z \in [0, L/2]^h \mid z_1 + \dots + z_h = L\}$. From the convexity and symmetry of variables of f , the minimum of f is attained at $z_1 = z_2 = \dots = z_h = L/h$, and $f(L/h, \dots, L/h) = 1/(1 - 2/h)$, which gives the following inequality

$$\sum_{e \in T} \theta_e c_{ij}^e \leq c_{ij} + \frac{\prod_{f \in T} (L - 2c_f)}{K} c_{ij} \leq c_{ij} + \left(1 - \frac{2}{h}\right) c_{ij} = 2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{h}\right) c_{ij}.$$

Since $C \leq C^e$ ($\forall e \in T$), it is obvious that $C \leq \sum_{e \in T} \theta_e C^e$.

Dependent Rounding $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; \pi)$

Input: A feasible solution $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ of LRP and a total order π of the hubs.

Step 1: Generate a random variable U which follows a uniform distribution defined on $[0, 1)$.

Step 2: Assign each non-hub node $p \in N$ to a hub $\pi(i)$, where $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, h\}$ is the minimum number that satisfies $U < x_{p\pi(1)} + \dots + x_{p\pi(i)}$.

Next, we describe a rounding technique proposed in [18]. We will describe a connection between the Monge matrix and the rounding technique, later,

The above procedure can be explained roughly as follows (see Figure 1). For each non-hub $p \in N$, we subdivide a rectangle of height 1 with horizontal segments into smaller rectangles whose heights are equal to the values of the given feasible solution $x_{p\pi(1)}, x_{p\pi(2)}, \dots, x_{p\pi(h)}$. Here we note that $\sum_{i \in H} x_{p\pi(i)} = 1$ ($\forall p \in N$). We assume that the smaller rectangles are heaped in the order π . We generate a horizontal line whose height is equal to the random variable U and round a variable x_{pi} to 1 if and only if the corresponding rectangle intersects the horizontal line.

Given a feasible solution $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ of LRP and a total order π of H , a vector of random variables X^π , indexed by $N \times H$, denotes a solution obtained by **Dependent Rounding** $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; \pi)$. In the following, we discuss the probability $\Pr[X_{pi}^\pi X_{qj}^\pi = 1]$.

Lemma 2. [18] *Let $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ be a feasible solution of LRP and π a total order of H . A vector of random variables $\mathbf{X}^\pi$ obtained by **Dependent Rounding** $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; \pi)$ satisfies that*

- (1) $E[X_{pi}^\pi] = x_{pi}$ ($\forall (p, i) \in N \times H$),
- (2) $E[X_{pi}^\pi X_{qj}^\pi] = y_{piqj}^\pi$ ($\forall (p, q) \in N^2, \forall (i, j) \in H^2$),




Fig. 1. Dependent Rounding π_ℓ where $(\pi(1), \pi(2), \pi(3), \pi(4)) = (2, 3, 4, 1)$.

where $\mathbf{y}^\pi$ is a unique solution of the following system of equalities

$$\sum_{i=1}^{i'} \sum_{j=1}^{j'} y_{p\pi(i)q\pi(j)}^\pi = \min \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{i'} x_{p\pi(i)}, \sum_{i=1}^{i'} x_{q\pi(j)} \right\} \quad (\forall (p, q) \in N^2, \forall (i', j') \in H^2). \quad (1)$$

Proof is omitted (see Appendix C or [18]).

In the rest of this paper, a pair of vectors $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^\pi)$ defined by (1) is called a *north-west corner rule solution* with respect to $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; \pi)$. When $\mathbf{x}$ is non-negative and $\sum_{i \in H} x_{pi} = \sum_{i \in H} x_{qi}$ holds, the unique solution of (1) gives the so-called *north-west corner rule solution* for a Hitchcock transportation problem (Figure 2 shows an example of a north-west corner rule solution where details are given in Appendix B or [18]). Here we note that the above definition is different from the ordinary definition of the north-west corner rule solution, which is known as a result of a procedure for finding a feasible solution of a Hitchcock transportation problem. In the rest of this section, we describe Hitchcock transportation (sub)problems contained in LRP.




Fig. 2. North-west corner rule solution where $(\pi(1), \pi(2), \pi(3), \pi(4)) = (2, 3, 4, 1)$. In this case, $E[X_{p1}^\pi X_{q1}^\pi] = 0.2$, $E[X_{p4}^\pi X_{q1}^\pi] = 0.1$, $E[X_{p4}^\pi X_{q4}^\pi] = 0.2$, $E[X_{p3}^\pi X_{q4}^\pi] = 0.1$, $E[X_{p3}^\pi X_{q3}^\pi] = 0.1$, $E[X_{p3}^\pi X_{q2}^\pi] = 0.2$, and $E[X_{p2}^\pi X_{q2}^\pi] = 0.1$.

Let $(\mathbf{x}^\circ, \mathbf{y}^\circ)$ be a feasible solution of LRP. For any $p \in N$, $\mathbf{x}_p^\circ$ denotes a subvector of $\mathbf{x}^\circ$ defined by $(x_{p1}^\circ, x_{p2}^\circ, \dots, x_{ph}^\circ)$. When we fix variables $\mathbf{x}$ in LRP to $\mathbf{x}^\circ$, we can decompose the obtained problem into n^2 Hitchcock transportation

problems $\{\text{HTP}(\mathbf{x}_p^\circ, \mathbf{x}_q^\circ, C) \mid (p, q) \in N^2\}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \text{HTP}(\mathbf{x}_p^\circ, \mathbf{x}_q^\circ, C): \quad & \min. \quad \sum_{i \in H} \sum_{j \in H} c_{ij} y_{piqj} \\ \text{s. t.} \quad & \sum_{j \in H} y_{piqj} = x_{pi}^\circ \quad (\forall i \in H), \\ & \sum_{i \in H} y_{piqj} = x_{qj}^\circ \quad (\forall j \in H), \\ & y_{piqj} \geq 0 \quad (\forall (i, j) \in H^2). \end{aligned}$$

Next, we describe a well-known relation between a north-west corner rule solution of a Hitchcock transportation problem and the Monge property.

Theorem 2. *If a given cost matrix $C = (c_{ij})$ is a Monge matrix with respect to a total order π of hubs, then the north-west corner rule solution $\mathbf{y}^\pi$ defined by (1) gives optimal solutions of all the Hitchcock transportation problems $\{\text{HTP}(\mathbf{x}_p^\circ, \mathbf{x}_q^\circ, C) \mid (p, q) \in N^2\}$.*

Proof is omitted here (see [6,7] for example).

4 Approximation Algorithm

In this section, we propose an algorithm and discuss its approximation ratio. First, we describe our algorithm.

Algorithm 4

Step 1: Solve the linear relaxation problem LRP and obtain an optimal solution $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$.

Step 2: For each edge $e \in T$, execute **Dependent Rounding** $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*; \pi^e)$ where π^e denotes a total order $(\pi^e(1), \pi^e(2), \dots, \pi^e(h)) = (\ell+1, \ell+2, \dots, h, 1, 2, \dots, \ell-1, \ell)$.

Step 3: Output a best solution obtained in Step 2.

In the rest of this section, we discuss the approximation ratio. We define

$$W_1^* = \sum_{(p,q) \in N^2} w_{pq} \left(\sum_{i \in H} c_{pi} x_{pi}^* + \sum_{j \in H} c_{jq} x_{qj}^* \right)$$

and

$$W_2^* = \sum_{(p,q) \in N^2} w_{pq} \left(\sum_{(i,j) \in H^2} c_{ij} y_{piqj}^* \right)$$

where $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$ is an optimal solution of LRP.

Theorem 3. *Algorithm 4 is a $2(1 - 1/h)$ -approximation algorithm.*

Proof. Let z^{**} be the optimal value of the original problem SAP and $(\theta_e \mid e \in T)$ be a vector of coefficients defined in Theorem 1. For each $e \in T$, $(X^{\pi(e)})$ denotes a solution obtained by **Dependent Rounding** $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*; \pi^e)$ and $\mathbf{y}^{\pi(e)}$ be the north-west corner rule solution defined by (1) (where π is set to π^e). Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{h}\right) z^{**} &\geq 2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{h}\right) (\text{optimal value of LRP}) = 2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{h}\right) (W_1^* + W_2^*) \\
&\geq W_1^* + 2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{h}\right) W_2^* = W_1^* + \sum_{(p,q) \in N^2} w_{pq} \left(\sum_{(i,j) \in H^2} 2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{h}\right) c_{ij} y_{piqj}^* \right) \\
&\geq \sum_{e \in T} \theta_e W_1^* + \sum_{(p,q) \in N^2} w_{pq} \left(\sum_{(i,j) \in H^2} \sum_{e \in T} \theta_e c_{ij}^e y_{piqj}^* \right) \quad (\text{Theorem 1}) \\
&= \sum_{e \in T} \theta_e W_1^* + \sum_{e \in T} \theta_e \left(\sum_{(p,q) \in N^2} w_{pq} \left(\sum_{(i,j) \in H^2} c_{ij}^e y_{piqj}^* \right) \right) \\
&\geq \sum_{e \in T} \theta_e W_1^* + \sum_{e \in T} \theta_e \left(\sum_{(p,q) \in N^2} w_{pq} (\text{optimal value of HTP}(\mathbf{x}_p^*, \mathbf{x}_q^*, C^e)) \right) \\
&= \sum_{e \in T} \theta_e W_1^* + \sum_{e \in T} \theta_e \left(\sum_{(p,q) \in N^2} w_{pq} \left(\sum_{(i,j) \in H^2} c_{ij}^e y_{piqj}^{\pi(e)} \right) \right) \quad (\text{Theorem 2}) \\
&= \sum_{e \in T} \theta_e \left(\sum_{(p,q) \in N^2} w_{pq} \left(\sum_{i \in H} c_{pi} x_{pi}^* + \sum_{j \in H} c_{jq} x_{jq}^* + \sum_{(i,j) \in H^2} c_{ij} y_{piqj}^{\pi(e)} \right) \right) \\
&= \sum_{e \in T} \theta_e \left(\sum_{(p,q) \in N^2} w_{pq} \left(\sum_{i \in H} c_{pi} \mathbb{E}[X_{pi}^{\pi(e)}] + \sum_{j \in H} c_{jq} \mathbb{E}[X_{jq}^{\pi(e)}] + \sum_{(i,j) \in H^2} c_{ij} \mathbb{E}[X_{pi}^{\pi(e)} X_{jq}^{\pi(e)}] \right) \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{e \in T} \theta_e \left(\sum_{(p,q) \in N^2} w_{pq} \left(\sum_{i \in H} c_{pi} X_{pi}^{\pi(e)} + \sum_{j \in H} c_{jq} X_{jq}^{\pi(e)} + \sum_{(i,j) \in H^2} c_{ij} X_{pi}^{\pi(e)} X_{jq}^{\pi(e)} \right) \right) \right] \\
&\geq \mathbb{E} \left[\min_{e \in T} \left\{ \sum_{(p,q) \in N^2} w_{pq} \left(\sum_{i \in H} c_{pi} X_{pi}^{\pi(e)} + \sum_{j \in H} c_{jq} X_{jq}^{\pi(e)} + \sum_{(i,j) \in H^2} c_{ij} X_{pi}^{\pi(e)} X_{jq}^{\pi(e)} \right) \right\} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[Z]
\end{aligned}$$

where Z denotes the objective value of a solution obtained by Algorithm 4. The last inequality in the above transformation is obtained from the equality $\sum_{e \in T} \theta_e = 1$ and the non-negativity of coefficients $(\theta_e \mid e \in T)$.

5 Discussions

In this paper, we proposed a polynomial time $2(1-1/h)$ -approximation algorithm for a cycle-star hub network design problem with h hubs. Our algorithm solves a linear relaxation problem and employs a dependent rounding procedure. The attained approximation ratio is based on an approximation of a cycle-metric matrix by a convex combination of Monge matrices.

Lastly we discuss a simple independent rounding technique which independently connects each non-hub node $p \in N$ to a hub node $i \in H$ with probability x_{pi}^* , where $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$ is an optimal solution of LRP. Iwasa et al. [18] showed that the independent rounding technique gives a 2-approximation algorithm for a single allocation hub-and-spoke network design problem under the following assumption.

Assumption 1 *A given symmetric non-negative cost matrix C satisfies $c_{ij} \leq c_{ik} + c_{kj}$ ($\forall(i, j, k) \in H^3$) and $c_{ij} \leq c_{pi} + c_{pj}$ ($\forall(i, j, p) \in H^2 \times N$).*

We also have the following result.

Lemma 3. *Under an assumption that $c_{ij} \leq c_{pi} + c_{pj}$ ($\forall(i, j, p) \in H^2 \times N$), a $\left(\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2(h-1)}\right)$ -approximation algorithm (for a cycle-star hub network design problem) is obtained by choosing the better of the two solutions given by Algorithm 4 and the independent rounding technique.*

Proof. Let a random variable Z_2 be an objective function value with respect to a solution obtained by the independent rounding technique. Iwasa et al. [18] showed that $E[Z_2] \leq 2W_1^* + W_2^*$. In the proof of Theorem 3, we have shown that $E[Z] \leq W_1^* + 2(1-1/h)W_2^*$. By combining these results, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} E[\min\{Z_2, Z\}] &\leq E\left[\frac{h-2}{2(h-1)}Z_2 + \frac{h}{2(h-1)}E[Z]\right] \\ &= \frac{h-2}{2(h-1)}E[Z_2] + \frac{h}{2(h-1)}E[Z] \\ &\leq \frac{h-2}{2(h-1)}(2W_1^* + W_2^*) + \frac{h}{2(h-1)}\left(W_1^* + 2\left(1 - \frac{1}{h}\right)W_2^*\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2(h-1)}\right)(W_1^* + W_2^*) \leq \left(\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2(h-1)}\right)(\text{opt. val. of SAP}). \end{aligned}$$

References

1. M. P. Adams and H. D. Sherali, “A tight linearization and an algorithm for zero-one quadratic programming problems,” *Management Science*, **32** (1986), pp. 1274–1290.
2. N. Alon, R. M. Karp, D. Peleg, and D. West, “A graph-theoretic game and its application to the k -server problem,” *SIAM Journal on Computing*, **24** (1995), pp. 78–100.

3. S. A. Alumur and B. Y. Kara, "Network hub location problems: The state of the art," *European Journal of Operational Research*, **190** (2008), pp. 1–21.
4. S. A. Alumur, B. Y. Kara, and O. E. Karasan, "The design of single allocation incomplete hub networks," *Transportation Research Part B*, **43** (2009), pp. 936–951.
5. R. Ando and T. Matsui, "Algorithm for single allocation problem on hub-and-spoke networks in 2-dimensional plane," in: Proceedings of ISAAC 2009, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, **7074** (2011), pp. 474–483.
6. W. Bein, P. Brucker, K. Park, and K. Pathak, "A Monge property for the d -dimensional transportation problem," *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, **58** (1995), pp. 97–109.
7. R. E. Burkard, B. Klinz, and R. Rudolf, "Perspectives of Monge properties in optimization," *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, **70** (1996), pp. 95–161.
8. H. Calik, S. A. Alumur, B. Y. Kara, and O. E. Karasan, "A tabu-search based heuristic for the hub covering problem over incomplete hubnetworks," *Computers and Operations Research*, **36** (2009), pp. 3088–3096.
9. J. F. Campbell, "A survey of network hub location," *Studies in Locational Analysis*, **6** (1994), pp. 31–47.
10. J. F. Campbell, A. T. Ernst, and M. Krishnamoorthy, "Hub arc location problems: Part I: introduction and results," *Management Science*, **51** (2005), pp. 1540–1555.
11. J. F. Campbell, A. T. Ernst, and M. Krishnamoorthy, "Hub arc location problems: Part II: formulations and optimal Algorithms," *Management Science*, **51** (2005), pp. 1556–1571.
12. J. F. Campbell and M. E. O’Kelly, "Twenty-five years of hub location research," *Transportation Science*, **46** (2012), pp. 153–169.
13. J. Chuzhoy and J. Naor, "The hardness of metric labeling," in: Proceedings of the 45th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 2004, pp. 108–114.
14. I. Contreras, E. Fernández, and A. Marín, "Tight bounds from a path based formulation for the tree of hub location problem," *Computers and Operations Research*, **36** (2009), pp. 3117–3127.
15. I. Contreras, E. Fernández, and A. Marín, "The tree of hubs location problem," *European Journal of Operational Research*, **202** (2010), pp. 390–400.
16. I. Contreras, "Hub location problems," in: Location Science, Chapter 12, G. Laporte, S. Nickel, and F. S. da Gama (Eds), Springer, 2015, pp. 311–344,
17. I. Contreras, M. Tanash, and N. Vidyarthi, "Exact and heuristic approaches for the cycle hub location problem," *Annals of Operations Research*, 2016, DOI:10.1007/s10479-015-2091-2.
18. M. Iwasa, H. Saito, and T. Matsui, "Approximation algorithms for the single allocation problem in hub-and-spoke networks and related metric labeling problems," *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, **157** (2009), pp. 2078–2088.
19. J. G. Kim and D. W. Tcha, "Optimal design of a two-level hierarchical network with tree-star configuration," *Computers and Industrial Engineering*, **22** (1992), pp. 273–281.
20. J. G. Klincewicz, "Hub location in backbone/tributary network design: a review," *Location Science*, **6** (1998), pp. 307–335.
21. J. Kleinberg and E. Tardos, "Approximation algorithms for classification problems with pairwise relationships," *Journal of ACM*, **49** (2002), pp. 616–630.
22. M. Labbé and H. Yaman, "Solving the hub location problem in a star-star network," *Networks*, **51** (2008), pp. 19–33.

23. E. Martins de Sá, R. S. de Camargo, and G. de Miranda, “An improved Benders decomposition algorithm for the tree of hubs location problem,” *European Journal of Operational Research*, **226** (2013), pp. 185–202.
24. E. Martins de Sá, I. Contreras, J. F. Cordeau, R.S. de Camargo, and G. de Miranda, “The hub line location problem,” *Transportation Science*, **49** (2015), pp. 500–518.
25. M. E. O’Kelly, “A quadratic integer program for the location of interacting hub facilities,” *European Journal of Operational Research*, **32** (1987), pp. 393–404.
26. M. E. O’Kelly and H. J. Miller, “The hub network design problem: A review and synthesis,” *Journal of Transport Geography*, **2** (1994), pp. 31–40.
27. J. Sohn and S. Park, “A linear program for the two-hub location problem,” *European Journal of Operational Research*, **100** (1997), pp. 617–622.
28. J. Sohn and S. Park, “The single allocation problem in the interacting three-hub network,” *Networks*, **35** (2000), pp. 17–25.
29. H. Saito, T. Fujie, T. Matsui, and S. Matuura, “A study of the quadratic semi-assignment polytope,” *Discrete Optimization*, **6** (2009), pp. 37–50.
30. H. Yaman, “Star p -hub median problem with modular arc capacities,” *Computers and Operations Research*, **35** (2008), pp. 3009–3019.
31. H. Yaman and S. Elloumi, “Star p -hub center problem and star p -hub median problem with bounded path lengths,” *Computers and Operations Research*, **39** (2012), pp. 2725–2732.

Appendix A Proof of Lemma 1

Here we briefly describe a proof of Lemma 1.

Proof. Let C' be a matrix obtained from C^e by permuting rows and columns simultaneously in the ordering $(\ell + 1, \ell + 2, \dots, h, 1, 2, \dots, \ell)$. We consider each quadruple (i, i', j, j') of indices satisfying $1 \leq i < i' \leq m, 1 \leq j < j' \leq n$. Since C^e is symmetric, it suffices to show the following three cases:

- (i) if $i \leq i' \leq j \leq j'$, then $c'_{ij} + c'_{i'j'} = c'_{ii'} + 2c'_{ij} + c'_{jj'} = (c'_{ij} + c'_{i'j})$,
- (ii) if $i \leq j \leq i' \leq j'$, then $c'_{ij} + c'_{i'j'} = c'_{ij} + c'_{i'j'} + c'_{ji'} + c'_{i'j} = (c'_{ij} + c'_{i'j})$,
- (iii) if $i \leq j \leq j' \leq i'$, then $c'_{ij} + c'_{i'j'} = c'_{ij} + c'_{j'i'} + 2c'_{jj'} = c'_{ij} + c'_{ji'} = (c'_{ij} + c'_{i'j})$.

Thus, we have the desired result.

Appendix B North-West Corner Rule

A Hitchcock transportation problem is defined on a complete bipartite graph consists of a set of supply points $A = \{1, 2, \dots, I\}$ and a set of demand points $B = \{1, 2, \dots, J\}$. Given a pair of non-negative vectors $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \in \mathbb{R}^I \times \mathbb{R}^J$ satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^I a_i = \sum_{j=1}^J b_j$ and an $I \times J$ cost matrix $C' = (c'_{ij})$, a Hitchcock transportation problem is formulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{HTP}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, C') : \quad & \min. \quad \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{j=1}^J c'_{ij} y_{ij} \\ \text{s. t.} \quad & \sum_{j=1}^J y_{ij} = a_i \quad (i \in \{1, 2, \dots, I\}), \\ & \sum_{i=1}^I y_{ij} = b_j \quad (j \in \{1, 2, \dots, J\}), \\ & y_{ij} \geq 0 \quad (\forall (i, j) \in \{1, 2, \dots, I\} \times \{1, 2, \dots, J\}), \end{aligned}$$

where y_{ij} denotes the amount of flow from a supply point $i \in A$ to a demand point $j \in B$.

We describe north-west corner rule in Algorithm NWCR, which finds a feasible solution of Hitchcock transportation problem $\text{HTP}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, C')$. It is easy to see that the north-west corner rule solution $Y = (y_{ij})$ satisfies the equalities that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{i'} \sum_{j=1}^{j'} y_{ij} = \min \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{i'} \alpha_i, \sum_{j=1}^{j'} \beta_j \right\} \quad (\forall (i', j') \in \{1, 2, \dots, I\} \times \{1, 2, \dots, J\}).$$

Algorithm NWCR

- Step 1:** Set all the elements of matrix Y to 0 and set the target element y_{ij} to y_{11} (top-left corner).
- Step 2:** Allocate a maximum possible amount of transshipment to the target element without making the row or column total of the matrix Y exceed the supply or demand respectively.
- Step 3:** If the target element is y_{IJ} (the south-east corner element), then stop.
- Step 4:** Denote the target element by y_{ij} . If the sum total of j th column of Y is equal to b_j , set the target element to y_{ij+1} . Else (the sum total of Y of i th row is equal to a_i), set the target element to y_{i+1j} . Go to Step 2.
-

Since the coefficient matrix of the above equality system is nonsingular, the north-west corner rule solution is a unique solution of the above equality system. Thus, the above system of equalities has a unique solution which is feasible to $\text{HTP}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, C')$.

Appendix C Proof of Lemma 2

We describe a proof of Lemma 2 briefly. See [18] for detail.

Proof. (1) When we introduce an index i' satisfying $\pi(i') = i$, it is easy to see that

$$\mathbb{E}[X_{pi}^\pi] = \Pr[X_{pi}^\pi = 1] = \Pr\left[\sum_{j=1}^{i'-1} x_{p\pi(j)} \leq U < \sum_{j=1}^{i'} x_{p\pi(j)}\right] = x_{p\pi(i')} = x_{pi}.$$

(2) We denote $\mathbb{E}[X_{pi}^\pi X_{qj}^\pi] = \Pr[X_{pi}^\pi X_{qj}^\pi = 1]$ by y'_{piqj} for simplicity. Then, the vector $\mathbf{y}'$ satisfies that for any pairs $(p, q) \in N^2$ and $(i', j') \in H^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{i'} \sum_{j=1}^{j'} y'_{p\pi(i)q\pi(j)} &= \Pr\left[\left[\sum_{i=1}^{i'} X_{p\pi(i)} = 1\right] \wedge \left[\sum_{j=1}^{j'} X_{q\pi(j)} = 1\right]\right] \\ &= \Pr\left[\left[U < \sum_{i=1}^{i'} x_{p\pi(i)}\right] \wedge \left[U < \sum_{j=1}^{j'} x_{q\pi(j)}\right]\right] \\ &= \Pr\left[U < \min\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{i'} x_{p\pi(i)}, \sum_{j=1}^{j'} x_{q\pi(j)}\right\}\right] \\ &= \min\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{i'} x_{p\pi(i)}, \sum_{j=1}^{j'} x_{q\pi(j)}\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

From the above, $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}')$ satisfies the system (1) defined by $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; \pi)$. The non-singularity of (1) implies $\mathbf{y}' = \mathbf{y}^\pi$.